

July 15, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

16465

One of the council's early actions, I believe, should be a start on the development of a comprehensive national water policy.

The policy should not only advance solutions to our current water management problems but long-range planning for future water needs as well.

Certainly this policy should call for a step-up in the Federal Government's already impressive progress in perfecting the desalting of sea water.

The Bechtel Corp. recently made an important report to the Interior Department, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Metropolitan Water District of southern California.

It reported that sea water could be transformed into fresh water with atomic power at about one-fifth of current cost.

That would put the cost—a minimum of 22 cents a thousand gallons—close to what southern California expects to be paying for natural fresh water from inland sources within the next few years.

Such a rate would be favorable for other sections of the country where water is scarce.

The Bechtel report indicated that such low-cost desalinization could be accomplished by a \$300 million plant situated south of Los Angeles producing electric power as a byproduct.

The plant would produce 150 million gallons of water a day—enough for a city of 750,000 persons.

The power output would be 1,800 megawatts, enough for a city of 2 million—bigger than the Hoover Dam's capacity of 1,300 megawatts.

The council should press forward with federally-financed research into new methods of water purification. The Rand Development Corp. has developed a startling new water purification system that uses coal and which produces electric power as a byproduct.

Other possibilities that should be considered by the council include use of flood control dams to create reservoirs, civilian use of reservoir system at vacant military installations, and transporting water supplies by tank car to emergency areas.

Another priority item on the Interdepartmental Council's agenda should be early discussions with Canada looking toward the development of a North American water policy.

A plan has been conceived by a distinguished Canadian engineer, Thomas W. Kierans, of Sudbury, Ontario, for diverting Hudson Bay-bound rivers into the Great Lakes.

The plan calls for delivering 24,000 cubic feet per second of new water to the Great Lakes and for dependably managing the levels, flows, and quality of the Great Lakes.

If carried out, the plan could assist in the solution of a number of the problems I cited earlier:

The new water would raise the levels of the Great Lakes.

It would flush out pollutants from the lakes.

It would enable Chicago and Ohio to divert the water they require.

The water could be diverted into either the Hudson or Delaware Rivers watersheds to provide for the increased needs of Atlantic seaboard metropolitan areas.

A start has been made in this general direction.

Private engineering firms are studying the plan's economic feasibility. And the International Joint Commission now is studying the twin problems of water quality and quantity in the Great Lakes.

But I regret that the chairmanship of the U.S. section of the International Joint Commission has been vacant for 1 year—since July 1964, when our colleague, the gentleman from Wyoming, left the post to run for the House of Representatives.

We did, however, have an indication of increased attention to relations with our northern neighbor this week when the White House made public a report recommending close, continuous, and candid consultation between the United States and Canada as the cornerstone of improved relations between the two nations.

President Johnson asked the Secretary of State to take the lead for the United States in a prompt review of the report and its recommendations.

I earnestly hope that Mr. Rusk will indeed take the lead and inaugurate conversations with the Canadian Government on the matter of joint planning of a North American water policy which would include jointly undertaking the huge Great Lakes replenishment project advanced by Mr. Kierans.

The Nation's water problems mount. Fifteen years from now we will need facilities to supply twice as much water as we use today.

Clearly, the time has come to act and to plan. *Pucinski Fitzgerald*  
W H (DR) CA  
THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC AND THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the recent tragic events in the Dominican Republic, I am sure a good many Americans acquired the false impression that all of Latin America was up in arms against the United States because of President Johnson's action in sending troops.

There are many reasons why this false impression gained currency. There were, in some Latin American capitals, the usual street demonstrations by the usual small elements. There were the expected outcries from the traditionally anti-American groups. And there were, of course, the usual sensational news reports of student rallies or flag-burnings or overturned cars. Mixed in with these reports were, of course, legitimate protests from responsible elements. I would not suggest that only small bands of vociferous extremists criticized the American action. Indeed, since concern was expressed in many responsible quarters.

But I think it is time to put in per-

spective the reaction of Latin Americans to the U.S. role in the Dominican crisis.

To begin with, I would like to point out that only two Latin American chiefs of state criticized President Johnson's action. I think we should remember also that in all the voting in the Organization of American States during the crisis the positions taken by the United States were supported on every occasion by two-thirds or more of the member nations. Indeed, in the first crucial test—on the resolution asking the OAS itself to assume the responsibility for restoring order in the Dominican Republic—only five Latin American nations declined to go along.

But perhaps the best measure of Latin American sentiment throughout the crisis is the newspaper editorial reaction throughout the hemisphere.

In the first days of the Dominican crisis, when U.S. troops were landed, there was indeed widespread editorial criticism. Gradually, however, as the picture of utter chaos emerged from the Dominican Republic the editorial tone shifted in many Latin American countries to sympathy, understanding and even support for the decisive action of President Johnson.

Let me give you some examples:

In Rio de Janeiro, the widely read O Jornal declared that:

The intervention of the American Armed Forces in Santo Domingo \* \* \* was not only urgent but indispensable.

The editorial added that:

The theoreticians of self-determination and nonintervention protest that the presence of American warships in Santo Domingo constitutes a flagrant violation of U.S. agreements with other hemisphere powers in the treaties of Bogotá and Rio de Janeiro. But it must be admitted that awaiting the formal procedures of those treaties would have sacrificed hundreds, even thousands of innocent persons.

In Colombia, while one liberal newspaper initially called the U.S. action unwarranted intervention, another liberal journal, El Espectador, said President Johnson's reasons for intervening were acceptable in face of the fact that no government existed in the Dominican Republic. In fairness, however, let me add that El Espectador insisted that in form and essence our action was incorrect. But later on, the other leading liberal newspaper, El Tiempo—which at first had condemned our action—declared, and I quote:

If President Johnson—who is better informed than we are—thinks there is a grave danger of a Castroist invasion of Santo Domingo and that this island could be converted into another Cuba, he was perfectly right in ordering intervention.

In Venezuela, another leading liberal journal, El Mundo of Caracas, decided that:

The Americans have acted well, with rapidity and foresight. There is no time to lose. Communism acts fast. It is organized and supported. The protest of some Latin American countries against intervention in Santo Domingo should now be choked off.

In Ecuador, the popular newspaperman and poet, Mr. Alejandro Carrion, declared in Guayaquil's El Universo:

July 15, 1965

In justice, and without justifying the U.S. action, it must be recognized that the armed intervention came after another armed intervention about which nothing was said, which was not condemned, and which was not interfered with. I refer to the armed intervention of the Communists.

In Mexico, which did not vote with us in the OAS, a leading conservative journal, *El Universal*, condemned our action in the Dominican Republic. Yet, at the same time, another leading conservative newspaper, *Excelsior*, found that:

The possibility that the Dominican Republic can become a second Cuba is something which affects the Dominicans as primary victims, but also all Latin Americans who would feel its weight as a threatening presence and a new center of agitation on a hemispheric scale.

Still another major newspaper in Mexico, the liberal *Novedades*, declared:

The landing of U.S. marines is justified by basic humanitarian principles.

This newspaper added that "it cannot be ignored" that "openly Communists armed groups, or persons inspired by such, are trying to establish a regime like Fidel Castro's \* \* \*."

The Havana regime is intervening in Dominican affairs through [these] armed organizations. The United States cannot permit this without incurring grave danger to hemispheric peace and unity.

I could continue citing favorable editorial reaction in almost every country in the hemisphere. But I think you can see from the examples I have given that the Latin American response to our action was by no means violent or one-sided. At the same time, I would not suggest that there was near-universal support for our action, nor would I intimate that there was little or no criticism. There was, without doubt, a good deal of criticism from nonextremist sources. The tone of that criticism was, however, largely restrained and reasonable. It suggests, in fact, that in Latin America today the specter of American economic imperialism backed up by bayonets has been consigned to its rightful residence—to the dusty pages of old history books. And as Eric Sevareid has pointed out, the new and very real specter in Latin America today is Communist political and paramilitary penetration. There is, I think, a growing realization that the independent American Republics must together take further steps to meet this new danger and this new challenge.

Later this summer, in August in Rio de Janeiro, the foreign ministers of the American Republics will meet in formal sessions to decide what measures can and should be taken to meet what the late Adlai Stevenson has aptly described as "camouflaged aggression—subversion so subtle that it can sometimes be exported without a fingerprint."

But there is an additional factor which is relevant here and which, to me, is fundamental in explaining the reactions of Latin America to the Dominican Republic crisis. There is not only an increasing recognition that the American nations must work more closely together to successfully resist this new aggression. There is a recognition of the need to continue the equally vital task of

rapidly improving the social and economic circumstances of the American people. This social sensitivity, coinciding with our own, was significantly responsible for the orientation of a series of inter-American declarations of policy reaching their spiritual and operational climax in the Alliance for Progress.

For almost 4 years, under the Alliance, the independent Latin American Republics and the United States have struggled side by side to meet a profound and mounting demand for social justice. There is today in Latin America a new willingness to accept the major responsibility for the success of this democratic, peaceful revolution. There is a growing awareness that long-term economic and social progress requires each nation to reform and modernize many traditional institutions.

Let me cite some instances of such reforms:

All of the 19 Latin American nations have improved their tax administration and 9 have enacted major tax reform programs.

Twelve countries have introduced new land reform programs.

Ten countries have come up with national development plans or sector investment programs. Other country programs are nearing completion.

Education budgets have increased some 13 percent, and 5 million more children are now attending school.

Fifteen countries have established self-help housing programs, and more than 300,000 new dwelling units have been completed or are about to be.

Nine countries have enacted laws fostering the growth of savings and loan associations, and eight countries now have new public or private development banks.

Thus it has become increasingly clear in Latin America that only through self-help can a nation or a people effectively marshal their own resources to meet the challenge of rapid development and to survive and compete in the modern world.

There is also a greater consciousness among the Latin American nations that cooperation with each other—such as we already see in the Central American Common Market and in the Latin American Free Trade Association—makes for the most rapid and solid progress.

The executive direction of the Alliance for Progress today is largely in Latin American hands. Through the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress, known as CIAP from its initials in Spanish, the Latin Americans themselves keep a vigilant eye on the pace of national development programs and multinational cooperative ventures. CIAP reports that last year Latin America achieved an overall increase of 2½ percent in gross national product. This was the challenging growth target set in mid-1961 when the Alliance was officially launched at Punta del Este, Uruguay. Under CIAP's prodding and intelligent leadership there is a fair chance that this same important goal will be reached again this year.

For its part, the United States continues its vigorous and full support of the

Alliance. Early this year President Johnson not only renewed the pledge of the United States to support all the Alliance objectives but also promised increasing participation of the United States in the years ahead. Secretary of State Rusk has suggested that now, in the aftermath of the chaotic and tragic events in the Dominican Republic, all the member nations of the Alliance for Progress face the challenge of building in that battered land the foundations for a modern, democratic life. The Dominican people, he said, "want what the rest of us want for ourselves: representative constitutional government, economic and social progress, hope that their children's lives will be happier and more fruitful than their own."

As for the political content of the Alliance, Secretary Rusk restated the position of the United States simply and clearly:

The United States welcomes change in Latin America. From its inception, the Alliance for Progress has been the cornerstone of our policy in Latin America. The Alliance objectives—of reform and development in democracy—are our objectives. They are our objectives because we have always believed in them, and because of their attainment in each and every country of Latin America is in our national interest.

#### THE COMMUNIST ASSOCIATIONS OF THURGOOD MARSHALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MR. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the President has nominated Thurgood Marshall to be Solicitor General of the United States and since this nomination does not come before the House for our approval or disapproval, I take this means as the only one available to me to put into the record for permanent reference, the information available to me of the Communist front associations of this man.

This may not be the entire record and, indeed, it probably is not, but at least it is a beginning.

The information I am about to present comes from the public records, files and publications of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

This material reveals that Thurgood Marshall was a member of the national committee of the International Juridical Association. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Juridical Association as "a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense" in Report No. 1311, dated March 29, 1944. Also, in a report on the National Lawyers Guild, prepared and published September 17, 1950, by the Committee on Un-American Activities, the International Juridical Association was cited as an organization which "actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line."

A list of officers of the National Lawyers Guild, as of December 1949 which is printed in the committee's report on the National Lawyers Guild on page 18, con-